का विषय यह है कि जहां देश में अनेक विघटनकारी शक्तियां सक्रिय है और अनेक विघटनकारी भावनाएं, क्षेत्रवाद, प्रान्तवाद की भावनाएं चल रही है देश को बिखेरने के लिए, वहा हमारे विश्वविद्यालयों में संकीर्ण भावनाएं प्रवेश कर चुकी हैं। दुर्भाग्य से नाम तो विश्वविद्यालय हैं, जिसके मायने हैं कि विश्व भर के बच्चे उसमें दाखिला ले सकते हैं, लेकिन बढ़ती हुई संकीर्ण भावना के कारण ऐसा हो नहीं रहा है। आज ऐसे अनेक विश्वविद्यालय हैं, बिना नाम लिए हुए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जिनमें यह पाबन्दी लगा दी गई है कि उस विशेष प्रांत से बाहर के बच्चे उसमें प्रवेश नहीं ले सकते। वे चाहे मेडिकल कालेज हों, चाहे इंजिनियरिंग हों और चाहे अन्य कालेज हों विश्वविद्यालय में प्रान्त से बाहर का कोई बच्चा लिया नहीं जाए यह बहुत सख्ती से हो गया है। इस संकीर्ण भावना के कारण दूसरे प्रान्तों के बच्चे दाखिले से वंचित रह जाते हैं वे चाहे महाराष्ट्र से हों, बंगाल से हों या किसी और प्रान्त से हों। इस भावना को व्यापक रूप से चला दिया गया है, लेकिन पहले यह भावना नहीं थी। जब से हमारा देश आजाद हुआ उसके बाद से ही ये छोटी भावनाएं पनपी हैं। मैं इस विशेष महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न के द्वारा यह भी मांग करना चाहूंगा कि जो हमारी नई शिक्षा पद्धति होने जा रही हैं उसमें यह स्पष्ट रूप से लिखा जाए कि विश्वविद्यालयों में योग्यता के आधार पर ही प्रवेश मिलेगा और या फिर कोई अन्य कंडीशन लगा दें जिससे कि सारे देश भर के बच्चों को किसी भी विश्वविद्यालय में दाखिल होने का मौका मिल सके। मैं समझता हूं कि इससे जो बच्चों की नई पीढ़ी आने वाली हैं उनमें देश की एकता और अखण्डता की भावना का प्रादुर्भाव होगा उनमें जब राष्ट्रीय एकता की भावना उत्पन्न होगी तभी देश एक रह सकता है वरना ये छोटे-छोटे भावनाएं देश को खंडित करने जा रही हैं। यदि हम बच्चों की भावी पीढ़ी में देश की एकता के लिए, विशेषकर शिक्षण संस्थाओं में क्षेत्रवाद और प्रांतवाद की संकीर्ण भावनाओं से ऊपर उठकर, योग्यता के आधार पर प्रवेश दिला सके तो मैं समझता हूं कि इससे हम देश के साथ एक बहुत बड़ा न्याय कर सकेंगे।

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Re. visit of NAM Ministerial Group to Libya and UN Headquarters, New York

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the NAM Ministerial Group consisting of Foreign Ministers of India, Yugoslavia and Cuba and Ambassadors of Ghana, Congo and Senegal representing their Foreign Ministers visited Tripoli (Libya) on April 20-21, 1986 and the UN Headquarters in New York on April 23—25, 1986, in pursuance of the mandate given by the Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Nonaligned Countries held in New Delhi on April 16—19, 1986. I had the honour of leading this Ministerial Group which represented the wide spectrum of the Movement and its universal geographical spread.

The Group was received by H. E. Col. Muammar El Gaddafi on April 20. He conveyed the profound thanks and the deep appreciation of the authorities and the people of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for the firm support and solidarity extended by the Nonaligned Movement at this critical juncture. He felt that the world take note of the US action which had caused considerable damage and devastation to civilian life and property: He disclaimed any terrorist action on his part. According to him the main reason for tension in the region was the denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians who had been forced to resort to violent methods to achieve their goals.

At the UN Headquarters in New York, the Group called on the Secre-

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

tary General of the UN and the President of the Security Council and handed over to them the Communique adopted at the Emergency Meeting of the Non-alingned Foreign Ministers and Heads of delegations on April 15 on the Libyan issue. It also conveyed to them the profound concern of the Movement at the disturbing turn of events and the need for the UN to act urgently to prevent further escalation of an already tense situation.

In my statement in the Council I reiterated our principled position that we were opposed to all forms of terrorism whether committed by individuals, group of individuals or organised by States. We are prepared to lend our support to any well considered international cooperative effort to deal with this menace. At the same time, we could not but be gravely concerned at the violation of norms of international behaviour by sovereign states. We are also seriously concerned at the implications of recent events for the security of small states.

At the meeting of the Security Council convened at the request of the Group on April 24, I presented before the Council a position of principle based on the UN Charter. I stressed the imperative necessity of restraint being exercised at this critical juncture, and urged the Secretary General particularly since the Council had been paralysed by the triple veto, to continue his peace efforts. The Secretary General appreciated the strength and support given by the Movement and assured us that he was doing and indeed would continue to do all he could.

Besides me, the Foreign Ministers of Cuba and Yugoslavia as well as Permanent Representatives to the UN of Ghana and Congo (representing their Foreign Ministers) also spoke in the debate. The Permanent Representatives of USA and UK defended action of their governments and were critical of the stand taken by the Non-alingned Movement on the Libyan issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now clarifications by Members—Shri Mohunta.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA (Haryana): Sir, I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the last portion of para 2 of his statement in which he says that according to Col. Gaddafi, the main reason for tension in the region was the denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians who had been forced to resort to violent methods to achieve their goals. I want to ask the hon. Minister whether the Libyan Government, Col. Gaddafi was prepared to denounce these terrorist activities on the part of the Palestinians who were forced to achieve their goals through such violent methods. Was it condemned at any particular forum? Whether you, as the Foreign Minister of this great country, and being guided by the principle of condemning terrorism in all forms by any group under whatever circumstances, did you condemn it at any stage, did you condemn the role of these Palestinian organisations or groups who were forced to resort to violent methods to achieve their goals? Did you bring this to the notice of these three vetoing powers who had vetoed it in the Security Council that it was not Col. Gaddafi at all who was behind these terrorist activities, but those people were, according to Col. Gaddafi, being forced to do it, whom we do not support and nor Col. Gaddafi supports? Was this attitude projected in the proper forum by you as the great Foreign Minister of a great country like India? *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Sir, in the last part of the hon. Minister's statement it has been said that the Permanent Representatives of the USA and the UK defended the action of their Governments and were critical of the stand taken by

the Non-Aligned Movement on the Libyan issue. Sir, although France also joined them in vetoing down the Resolution of the Security Council but it appears from the newspaper reports that some of the Western allies also could not support the US action against Libya. Now, I would like to know how far the visit of the NAM Ministers' group to Libya has contributed to the widening of any rift between the USA and their Western allies, and if so, I would like to know which are the western countries which have now openly opposed the US action against Libya. Secondly, Sir, this is not the first time that the US has committed aggression against Libya. Previously they had committed aggression against Grenada. The USA is committing aggression one after another on smaller countries. May I know what the NAM contemplates to do in order to refrain the USA from the recurrence of such aggression in any part of the world?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the clarification that I seek relates to the last sentence of the hon. Minister's statement. Then the last sentence refers to the defence of the action of the respective Governments by the Permanent Representatives in the United Nations of the USA and the UK. That they were critical of the stand of the Non-Aligned is understandable because this is a highly complex moral issue that has come up in front of the world body as such and the non-aligned are certainly not morally non-aligned. Therefore, the stand taken by the non-aligned was for morality. The clarification that I seek refers to the statement of General Vernon Walters relating to the stand taken by the Non-Aligned with particular reference to India and the incidents of terrorism in India. I find the statement of General Walters highly objectionable. Even if I attempted to I would find it difficult to match the intemperance of his language that he has used. I would, therefore, request the Minister to inform us whether, when he was in New York on the occasion of the Security Council debate, did he have any occasion to meet General Walters. The statement was perhaps issued after the hon. Minister had already left New York and, therefore, an occasion to seek a meeting or seek a clarification from what General Walters has said, could not have been there. However, has the Government of India taken note of it? Having taken note of it, is the Government of India merely content with what the newspapers have reported as the hon. External Affairs Minister's reaction, or, are you going to react to it more firmly and forcefully, certainly on aspects which, concern the U.S. attitude to terrorism in India?

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय मंत्री जी से मैं दो प्रश्नों का उत्तर चाहता हूं। पहला यह कि 23, 24 और 25 अप्रैल को तीन दिन वे न्यूयार्क में रहे। उनकी ओर से या हमारे प्रतिनिधि की ओर से इस इश्यू को यू० एन० ओ० की जो साधारण सभा है, उसमें उठाने की कोशिश की, उठाया गया या उठाया जाएगा और वहां से इस बात की चेष्टा होगी कि कोई प्रस्ताव उन लाईंस पर जिन लाईंस पर परनाम ने यहां प्रस्ताव पास किया है, उन लाईंस पर यू० एन० ओ० की जनरल बाडी में प्रस्ताव पास हो ? क्या इसकी आप ने कोशिश की या नहीं ?

दूसरा प्रश्न मेरा यह है कि क्या इन दिनों में अमरीका के प्रतिनिधि से भी उनकी बातचीत हुई थी या नहीं ? क्या जिन उद्देश्यों के लिए यू० एन० ओ० की स्थापना की गई थी जिसमें अमरीका के राष्ट्रपति रूजवेल्ट भ थे, और ऐसे ही इश्यू के लिए देश सैक्यूरिटी काउंसिल में जाते हैं, तो अमरीका इस इश्यू को लेकर सैक्यूरिटी काउंसिल में क्यों नहीं गया और इस संबंध में आपकी उनसे क्या बातचीत हुई तथा उन्होंने क्या उत्तर दिया ?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, what happened? Are you not going party-wise?

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have all condemned the U.S. action and I do not want to repeat what has been said earlier. But there has been a reference to the stand taken by the permanent representative of the U.S., Gen. Walters. Newspaper reports at least suggest that not only be used very intemperate language, but he went into the very basic issue against India. He followed it up by an interview in the television and I am quoting what he is reported to have said. He is reported to have said that 'U.S.A. will go on co-operating with India in dealing with it only if they (meaning India) do certain things right'. This really goes beyond the intemperate language and the snide remarks which he made in his speech before the U.N. Security Council. What is more important is, he is now threatening that in regard to dealing with terrorism in India, the threat of secession in our country, there will be no co-operation from his Governmnent till we fall in line with the U.S.A. This is a matter of our national honour. This is a matter far more basic and far more fundamental. I want the Government to react very possitively and assertively that we will not be cowed down by anyone. We should take very strong exception and see that he withdraws these remarks.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Madan Bhatia.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Sir, what happened? I have given my name. Are you not going party-wise? You are calling two people from the same party.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): He is a nominated Member.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your name is not there. Mr. Satyanarayana Reddy's name is there.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: All right. Call him.

SHRI MADAN BHATIA (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the forthright leadership given by India as Chairman of the non-aligned movement in strongly condemning the action of the US was in conformity with the finest traditions of an independent and principled stand which India has been taking right from its birth as an independent nation on all foreign policy issues. For this I would like to congratulate the Government. Sir, I would like to seek a clarification on the statement of Gen. Walters to which attention has been drawn by two hon. Members. It was reported by the press that he said in the United Nations Security Council that the United States is not going to forget the condemnation of the United States' action by the non-aligned countries and he made a particular insinuation against India in this context. Sir, this was a most pernicious and perilous threat which could possibly be uttered against the non-aligned countries in general and against India in particular. The threats which are uttered by the responsible representatives of the United States are usually not empty threats. Therefore, it is in this regard that I want to draw the attention of the Government of India as to whether the Government of India has taken up this issue with the United States in a forthright manner. When I say the threats which are uttered by the United States are not empty threats, I am reminded of the threat which was uttered by Kissinger to Mr. Bhutto when he talked of the Islamic atomic bomb. He is reported to have gone on record to say that we shall make a horrible example out of you. And that threat was not an empty threat. Considering the tragic developments which have been dealt with

very effectively and very dicisively by the Government of India in the last few days. I respectfully submit that the people in this country are beginning to imagine whether this declaration of Khalistan in the last few days had some casual connection with this threat which was uttered by the United States in the middle of April because this declaration has come almost on the heels of this particular threat. Will the Government of India enlighten the Members of this hon. House through the hon. Minister whether there is some seeming connection between the two events?

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr Deputy Chairman, Sir, I would like to put two questions to the hon. Minister. Firstly, has the Government of India or the NAM decided to take up this issue to the General Assembly? If not, why? Secondly, Sir, the permanent representative of the U.S. Government has made such sinister remarks against non-aligned countries, including India. Has the Government of India or the NAM lodged a protest against these remarks with the United States of America? Is the Government of India thinking of taking any measures to see that such remarks do not come from the United States or any other country?

श्री कल्पनाथ राय : आदरणीय उपसभापति महोदय, क्या विदेश मंत्री जी यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि त्रिपोली में गये 'नम' मंडल में किसी अरब देश के प्रतिनिधि को क्यों नहीं शामिल किया गया ? अमेरिका और इंगलैंड के नेताओं का यह कहना कि कर्नल गद्दाफी पूरे आतंकवादियों का नेता है, हर देश के आतंकवादियों की मदद करता है उनके ऐसा कहने में क्या सत्यता है ? दूसरे भारत द्वारा जो कदम उठाया गया है क्या उस कदम से अमेरिका बहुत गुस्से नाराज है और क्या इसका परिणाम यह भी होगा कि विश्व बैंक या इन्टरनेशनल मानेटरी फंड से जिसके माध्यम से हमारे देश को आर्थिक सहायता मिलती है क्या उसको भी रोकने का प्रयास अमेरिका करेगा ? क्या अमेरिका उन राष्ट्रों को भी, जैसे पाकिस्तान है या जो हमारे दुश्मन हैं उनको भारत पर आक्रमण करने के लिए भड़कायेगा ? क्या यह बात सही है कि हमने जो लीबिया के सम्बन्ध में कदम उठाया उससे गुस्से में आकर अमेरिका पाकिस्तान में आतंकवादियों को भारी पैमाने पर मदद कर रहा है जो देश के अन्दर आकर अपनी गतिविधियां तेज करके भारत की राजनीतिक अस्थिरता के लिए एक खतरा बन गये हैं ? ऐसी स्थिति में सरकार साम्राज्यवादी ताकतों द्वारा उठाये जा रहे इन संकटों के निराकरण के लिये कोई नीति बना रही है ? क्या इन प्रश्नों पर भारत सरकार सावधान और सजग है ? उन शक्तियों द्वारा उठाये गये खतरों का मुकाबला करने के लिए सरकार क्या कदम उठा रही है?

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the hon. Members have raised a number of questions. I would like to briefly deal with them. Some of it has been dealt within my statement itself. The answer is there. But all the same, I would like to deal with them as they have been raised.

The first point that was raised was about the views of His Excellency Col. Gaddafi on terrorism and the question whether the denial of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians is the cause of violence in this region. He has asked for my views on this. This relates to the concept of terrorism or definition of terrorism We have said in the statement—and this is the position of the Non-Aligned Movement also—that the Non-Aligned Movement is totally opposed to terrorism of all forms. In my statement I have said whether it is by individuals, or group of individuals, or by a State—all forms. This is a debatable question and this question has been taken up at the U.N. General Assembly. We have now debated in the last meeting of the Coordination Bureau

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

of NAM all the aspects of terrorism. In our NAM we have maintained the position that the Palestinian cause—the nations which are engaged in their liberation struggle—and it is a known fact that the Palestinian people are engaged in the liberation struggle—so this we have said that this is a different question altogether. Similarly, the liberation struggle of the South African people against racism and apartheid, cannot be...

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: Sir, my question has not been understood at all. That is why I am just getting up. I had asked whether you asked Col. Gaddafi to condemn those violent activities which were being perpetrated by the Palestinians because we are against all violence—of any kind, by any group.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: That is the question I am answering precisely. That is precisely the question I am answering. About the recent events in Berlin or any other place, which is the cause of action, for action against Libya, Chairman Arafat himself, because it was attributed to a special faction of the Palestinians, has disclaimed that he has any connection with it. Therefore the real answer to that is that to the extent it forms terrorist activity by an individual or by a group or by the State, we all condemn it. But we make a distinction. This is the point I want to emphasise. The liberation struggle is not terrorism. That is the position of NAM; that is our position also. And, therefore, I would not say anything more on this because this is a very complex question that is being debated in all forums—international, United Nations, NAM and all that.

SHRI SUSHIL CHAND MOHUNTA: I seek your protection, Sir. My question was a straightforward question—whether this issue was raised in the UN and other forums and whether Col. Gaddafi was asked to condemn all such activities and whether you condemned those activities.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot compel the Minister to give a particular answer.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I am sorry, Sir, I pose no threat to the honourable Member. I am trying to help him. I again repeat, we maintain a distinction between national liberation movements and terrorist activities. I have again defined "terrorist activities" for the benefit of the honourable Members, that it contains those whether by a group, individual or a State. I think nothing can be more clear than this.

The honourable Member who has just left asked whether the Permanent Representative of the United States in the UN criticiezd the Non-Aligned position. It is true that while making a statement he became argumentative, he even went to the extent of saying that Non-Aligned is aligned against the United States. These statements were made while he was speaking in the Security Council meeting. In that speech there was no direct reference to India because when he said "countries" he used the plural expression "countries" with whom his Government had cooperated in tackling terrorism within their countries. So he could mean any country and therefore there was no direct reference to India. It can only be very oblique. But all the same, the question that has been asked last has relevance to that—why there was no representative of the Arab countries in the delegations? While there was no representative in the six member countries, the representative of the Arab League in the United Nations participated He took the floor and answered the US Permanent Representative on this. He said that the Non-Aligned position was not aligned against any country. If you can call it so, Non-Aligned is aligned for peace. So, he very effectively put forth the Non-Aligned position. As I said, we took a principled stand that Non-Aligned is a movement for peace, Non-Aligned is a movement for the

independence and sovereignty of countries and for peace, and wherever the UN Charter is violated, wherever there are actions by sovereign States against international behaviour or international norms, we come up against them. Here I can quote the famous statement of our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in his first speech in the United Nations General Assembly when he went there in the fifties. He said, India will not be neutral when the question of peace is involved. Similarly, this is the Non-Aligned position, this is India's position. It was very effectively answered by the Secretary-General of the Arab League who spoke there. He took the floor and spoke there. As for the Arabs, as I said, this was drawn up in a hurry in the meeting itself and those who volunteered to come, they were willing to come. It was decided to send a delegation on the last day of the meeting and, unfortunately, by that time the Arab Ministers had left. Those who had come had left and therefore, although in this delegation there was no Arab Minister as such, we had the full support of the Arabs. This is personified in the strong satement and the very defence of the Non-Aligned position by the representative of the Arab League in the debate of the Security Council. Sir, a number of

1.00 P.M. hon. Members have asked what our reaction was to General Walters the U.S. permanent representative's intemperate speech. As I said, he spoke really after I had left, and I read it also on the way to this country. But even so, Sir, I believe that when he says that they will help, he is contradicting himself. In the Security Council when he spoke he said, his country had co-operated with countries in their problems of terrorism and he was surprised that it was criticised. But now he goes beyond that and says, this cooperation will be available if India's position, according to them, is right. India takes a stand which is agreeable to them. I do not think he represents his own Government. He is neither the Secretary of State or the President who make policy for their country. He is only a representative. So, I would not, I think, I would not react to what he said in the press interview except to say...

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: He is a representative of that country.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: I know. That is what I am saying. He is the representative, the permanent representative. He is not the Secretary of State, Mr. Schultz or he is not the President. Therefore, I believe that he does not represent the views of this country in this matter when he uses this language.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: That Government did not deny it.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: When he uses this language, this language is unfortunate. You can describe it in any manner. Our position is clear. This country, has a principled stand as far as this issue of war is concerned or the issue of threat to the unity and integrity of the country is concerned through terrorism or any other means When the whole Parliament, when the whole country is united, why should we afraid of anyone? We are not cowed down by any such threats or anything. So, there should be no fear on that account. We take certain principled position. Whether it is the Non-aligned Movement or India, it is known throughout, now it is several decade, that India has been taking a principled stand on all issues, so far as the international issues and international relations are concerned, and we are not cowed down for our views on any matters. On this matter the House has expressed its opinion, the Non-aligned Movement has expressed its opinion. On the mandate of the Non-aligned Movement, which was a unanimous mandate approved by the entire Non-aligned Movement, we went and represented the views of the Non-aligned Movement in this

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

world forum. I think we have done the right thing, we have done the thing which should have been done on the basis of principle. Of course, we have appealed for restraint because there is a serious situation in the Central Mediterranean. It should be all the parties concerned, the USA and others. We appealed personally to the Secretary-General that he should talk to the USA, United States of America and other parties concerned in the region, the countries of the Mediterranean, Libya included. Such a step should be prevented. There should not be any more escalation. I think this is the demand of the people of this country, and this is the right approach in this matter.

For calling a meeting of the General Assembly a question has been asked. There are certain procedures through which the General Assembly can be called. It can be called either through the Security Council or it can be called by the majority of the members, in consultation with the majority of the members of the United Nations. One is a quicker process and the other a longer process because consultations with the majority of the members of the General Assembly takes a longer time. But we have considered this in the Non-aligned Bureau in the last meeting that we had of the Groups which went there. And we said that this matter was open, this option was open. We will take a decision. The Non-aligned Bureau Group in New York will take a decision in the matter as the situation arises. But the main point is we must work for peace. We must work for prevention of such an event happening again. We must work for a restraint all over. That is what we precisely did and that was our mandate. We did it to the best of our ability.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stand adjourned till 2.30 P.M.

The House adjourned for Lunch at six minutes past one of the Clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-two minutes past two of the clock— Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

RESOLUTION RE: COMBATING THE DRUG MENACE AND REHABILITATION OF DRUG ADDICTS

DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA (Maharashtra): Sir, I beg to *move the following Resolution:*—

"This House recommends that Government should—

(i) take steps to combat effectively the spreading menace of drugs and narcotics, which are degenerating the nation, especially the younger generation, and

(ii) make institutional arrangement for the rehabilitation of drug addicts by using the revenue realised by way of penalties, seizures, etc. from offenders and drug traffickers."

Sir, if you permit me, I will speak in Hindi.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right.

डा० (श्रीमती) नाजमा हेपतल्ला : मान्यवर, आज जिस विषय के ऊपर मैं बोलने वाली हूं, वह एक बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय है और मुझे लगता है कि आज हमारे देश में दो खास अहम चीजें हैं जिन पर कि पूरे देश की निगाह लगी हैं। एक है टेरोरिजम और दूसरी है ड्रग एडिक्शन। दोनों ही अपने तौर पर हमारे समाज को, और देश को और हमारे यूथ को, हमारे नौजवानों को कमजोर कर रही हैं।